

Meeting Description: Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting

Date: November 7, 2002

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Location: Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room

I. Approval of October Meeting Minutes

II. Geographic Framework Program

A. Act 51 Reconciliation Update

Rob Surber, CGI, distributed a status map of the Act 51 update. The current project work area is the Act 51 reconciliation. The Act 51 process is a statewide program administered by Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT). It is a mechanism to provide road funding for all public roads in the state. The process uses map and geographic information system (GIS) data as a communication vehicle to deliver information to locals. It has historically been done through CAD or drafting methods. Now they are using the geographic framework base map and reconciling this legal documentation with the current state's GIS base. Intend to have it complete by the end of this year to send out maps to every county, city, and village in the state in January. Initially they make sure there is identity between roads that they legally say they have and the state base map. MDOT through a partnership with Michigan State Industries (MSI) has provided a complete set of the current working maps that were scanned and registered to the framework. Then these are used as backdrops to be used in the analysis. Also use digital ortho photography. As part of work, they have started all but 4 counties in Lower Peninsula and 15 in the Upper Peninsula. By the end of November, most of the counties will have been started and the rest of the state in December. CGI started another process of quality control in-house and it takes about 1-2 days. According to the status report, Oakland, Kent and Macomb counties are due to be done by the end of November. Plan to be done with Wayne County in December. The township work is harder than city work, because cities do not have measurement segments on the maps. MSI is checking road names that the Act 51 certified road names are there and when there are differences, it is noted. CGI will work with the local engineers for their review and will work with the local unit of government to confirm the official name. MSI is also checking legal system and other attributes. This is a legal document and will get reviewed and we will get phone calls. CGI is making sure seaming process is good to have a consistent product statewide. CGI has a cartographic mapping product that will come out from the GIS. CGI has been working on standards and procedures to create the product and are just waiting for final data checks from MSI before they start production. A copy of the Procedure Manual was presented. Will have 15-20 people creating the cartography that will be plotted and sent out through MDOT. It will be up to MDOT if this will be on the web. It will be a PDF product.

Chuck Bender, Michigan State Industries (MSI), commented that he would like to reference the standards on the web.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, asked if there is intent to strip down to Visual Basic for ArcGIS.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI is working on how much can be completely automated. One challenge that framework isn't in the ESRI geographic database yet. There are a number of programs to create. There are questions yet to be resolved in the final annotation product. One goal is to regenerate out of GIS a new version of GIS easily. Any scripts created will be made available. Cartography products out of

framework will be worked on next year. This Act 51 process creates strong relationships between locals and state for geographic information. Hopefully the users will benefit also.

B. Next Framework Version

Rob Surber, CGI, threw out plan to get feedback from the group. The plan is to create a non-referencing version, a standard GIS version without mile points, of framework. The problem is that will have to shut down production of framework for a 1-1 1/2 months to run quality control statewide versioning of the referencing. It is tough to do many times throughout the year. The plan is to create GIS versions of framework – would not have the new mile points. It is a logistical issue for CGI. GIS users mainly want GIS files to start their projects. The goal is to create one referencing version each year in April or May to coincide with the Act 51 process, the sufficiency process, and the Transportation Management System (TMS). A lot of systems cannot handle frequent referencing changes.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, stated that she thinks they would get one version every year so it doesn't get confusing.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that for anybody who uses the referencing it can be confusing when another version is released and they haven't completely updated from the last version. But CGI wants to continue to provide good map data. The big hold up for CGI has been getting referencing error free.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, commented that she will ask transportation department how this would effect them

Rob Surber, CGI, added that another benefit is that this is like a book closing.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that another user would be the crash community and they may want monthly versions.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that if they do, it will be a significant project to accommodate this need.

Bill Enslin, MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS, commented that during editing there are themes that don't change and asked if there is a way to identify in each release which themes have changed. If themes have not changed there is no sense for user to update those.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that there is a way and asked questions on the best way to inform the users. For instance, CGI currently stamps the edit feature by feature as work is done. Many new roads will have date stamp post Version 2 release but then attributes derive other themes. Could include them in a Metadata statement.

Bill Enslin, MSU, commented that when doing April/May reference release and it is posted on the web site, then there are subsequent releases the next year, could only put in theme part what has been changed and users would know whether to update.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that one theme that is changing in the new version is city and township boundaries. CGI is updating polygons to reflect the new annexations and generally put out a new city and township theme for the state. Could replace with new information and point to a list that changes through production.

Everett Root, CGI, commented that everything will change this version but in the future there may be times when hydro may not change.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that for the next meeting they will provide a tentative plan for the group to think about and provide feedback. Probably will need to model data to support cartography in a robust way, which now it doesn't, but there are other options. It will be clear after go through a cycle or two whether to explicitly store information in support of a standard base map product. Then this will be available for others. There

will be a review of all the classification codes for framework features available. CGI has taken data from MIRIS and census TIGER files without question. Believe that it is in the best interest of the user community to take complete look at those.

C. Digital Ortho Update

Sherm Hollander, Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), starting to get products that have been in production for the last 3 months. Received the Luce County block in Upper Peninsula (UP) and a number scatter quads in the UP and will be doing processing on them soon. Will have the Marquette County block in 2-3 weeks. They hope to have everything in production by December. It will complete the UP for 1998 Series and a number of counties in Lower Peninsula (LP). There are some scattered counties in southern LP to be done.

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that the state has complete digital ortho coverage.

D. National Hydro Dataset (NHD) Update

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that this is a national program to get linear referencing EPA River Reach data tied to vector line work to 1:24,000 accuracy. The state has submitted an innovative partnership (IP) proposal for grant money to fund a 3-year partnership to conflate that to the framework hydro and correct and improve to MIRIS digital topography maps. No decisions have been made yet, however money may not be as much as thought because of Homeland Security priorities at this time. The National Imagery Mapping Agency (NIMA) essentially has the lead to make sure that a dataset is developed for 133 metro urban counties in support of homeland security. Michigan has 4 identified areas that met the requirements – southeast Michigan, Flint, Lansing, and Grand Rapids. The Michigan IP partnership proposal received favorable reviews but not sure if they have money to fund this effort. But threw in the idea that hydro is an important homeland security dataset and that if Michigan could reprioritize and work on the 17 watershed units that touch these areas. If we work on them, USGS would propose that CGI would work on that as a dataset for this effort.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, asked if they are jumping to CIPI 3 at this point?

Rob Surber, CGI, answered that plan is for CIPI 3 to study hydro data and address these issues in support of Homeland Security. CIPI 3 has not been started yet. Want to have secure confidential data as well as public info integrated in form to help them respond in case of emergency for the 133 urban areas. EPA River Reach data is an important dataset because it lets model potential disasters. Certainly won't be able to go at same level of effort if there is no support for project. There is one person designated to developing standards and finishing work in UP hydro according to these standards. Depending on how this project goes forward, will have a set of standard for staff to work with. Will not go further without United States Geological Survey (USGS) and their support

Bill Enslin, MSU, commented that in the GIS systems when doing a select on river areas, expect to see continuity of the whole water course there - but there is not in a couple of cases Bill viewed. Classification is wrong. Request that somebody to see if continuous line.

Rob Surber, CGI, suggested that Bill contact Bret Nelson, CGI, about the discoveries and comments and cc Rob and they will see what can be done.

E. Qualified Voter File (QVF) / County Road Commission Partnerships

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that an effort is starting informally with Branch and Allegan Counties to discuss what the state can do to help local GIS efforts. They have recognized two significant local areas where the state, counties, and local units of government need to share information to support programs that run on information

exchange. The programs require GIS or geographic information – the clerk's offices for the QVF data and the county road commission for road certification. They are exploring that the county GIS office could become agent for these business processes because they are so map related. The QVF clerk's offices are not GIS qualified and roads and addresses bog them down. The clerk's offices have been asked if they would be interested in their GIS office providing information in GIS form and from a business perspective a couple of GIS offices want to become part of this process. The goal is that with the coordination of the clerk's office and the GIS office they would provide new roads and addresses to the state with attributes to be put into the state base map. Eventually would like to integrate this into the census. While QVF gets all roads (public and private), the road commission has to certify roads once a year and they feel it would be nice if the roads are in there and they just have to double check for accuracy. These are two processes that are being explored now. The goal is to come out with paradigm or model to take to other counties and say this is how it is working. Want to make this an important value to counties.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, commented that when this idea was mentioned to the townships, they were excited. They are overloaded as it is with work. If done right, in-house 9-1-1 applications stay current.

Eric Swanson, CGI, added that the state will be touching these two entities on statewide business processes and there is a way to create efficiency.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, added that their county clerk took the process away from the locals and then turned it over to their office. She would love to go the state web site to attach e00 file with new segments and have a work sheet to type in the road name and whether it is private and submit. Then she doesn't have to fill out the form and mail it in and have the clerk sign off.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that a goal is to run through and test ideas through a process. Discussed applying for Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) grants to cover costs. This seems to be a prime candidate for National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) relationships.

Michael Hass, Branch County, added that their clerks would like a map interface with Licensing Bureau. The big conflict now is that people give their zip code town versus the town they live in.

Everett Root, CGI, explained that there was a discussion with Rayan Ray, CGI, about this and system is not set up for that, it is not on line. The best avenue for the clerks is to go to their Department of State liaison and request it. The majority of the work is addresses that get thrown into bins because they don't fit the system.

Michael Hass, Branch County, added that once this is streamlined, the other end is addressing mistakes.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, commented that if you check with framework for the actual road rather than what they put in it will be correct and override.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that 85-90% of the voter registrations come through the Secretary of State's branch offices (the rest go through the clerks' counters). That is the weak link and that is where improvements need to take place. Because of Motor Voter most things can be handled by the Secretary of State (SOS).

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, added that a lot of addresses are feasible but no confirmed house number.

Rob Surber, CGI, noted that the law has to accommodate for homeless. And people can put 'under bridge' as their residence. To filter people because it is not a real address is against the law and the state must be careful not to do this.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU GIS Library, asked what townships physically get back – a list or an accurate map.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, asked what happens when they submit e00 files. Is there an automated routine to extract them?

Everett Root, CGI, answered that they are working on that now. There is a special e-mail box for them to be sent to. You would import e00 file and get a geographic coverage and a DBF. It is then up to CGI staff how to get the data out of the DBF that will match and go into the street index. Then the local level needs to sign off.

Eric Swanson, CGI, stated that we may find that if the county GIS is designated as authority, they would have the final approval.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, commented that the concern is that the clerks think that if they want it, they still have control.

Eric Swanson, CGI, commented that this is the model used for other pilots. This may be an opportunity for the county GIS offices to position themselves to serve as the official agent on behalf of the entities within the county. If this can be done for 50 counties, there will be a huge savings and opportunities. Due to individual county politics may have to touch more than one office.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that they found that the clerks are reporting new roads and addresses three weeks before an election and the roads have been there a while. The roads are built months before. If roads are in the database it helps GIS user community. There will be counties that do not have a local GIS office but want to send data to the state and some county commissions have policy about selling files. Reality is that politics will play a role in this.

Eric Swanson, CGI, stated that the QVF is a law and Act 51 is law. We are trying to create an opportunity that may turn into a new one.

Michael Hass, Branch County, added that we cannot ignore the 9-1-1 aspect.

Eric Swanson, CGI, added that if you look across state every local jurisdiction and counties have clerks. The GIS community is not as consistent across the state. This may drive consistency in the GIS community.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that these are legal documents. Act 51 documents are coming in certified, which should help the Census Bureau. This is the idea and locals still have controls they want because they have the knowledge and business processes and that's not the state's business. It comes around that many people benefit from this information – for example the Michigan State Police (MSP) would like to have current accurate information for emergency management.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, asked if there is there a plan to reconcile QVF to framework. When a local clerk types in an address to register a voter, the framework would check to see if that road exists.

Eric Swanson, CGI, responded discussions have been under way with the Department of State for 3 years now and this was the original intent. It took a different route for many reasons. But the opportunity to bring it together is here now.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that there is going to be a process put in place and when new things come in, they will come directly out of framework. There is going to be some scrubbing and purification over time with use.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, commented that the two largest discrepancies are the school districts and boundaries of municipalities. Both are parcel based and don't match framework

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that as their agent the local's agent, you will get the phone calls.

Eric Swanson, CGI, added that QVF is more than a road, house, and address range. It includes the school district and precincts.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that the locals retain all the parcel data and it is the foundation for good information. Will continue to report on this pilot project. The product should be something that everybody can look at.

Eric Swanson, CGI, added that we can achieve vertical integration. We will have one base map across the board.

F. Watershed Grant Opportunity

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that the EPA is launching a new grant program to encourage protection and restoration of our country's water bodies through the use of watershed approaches. The present fiscal year 2003 budget (which is now before congress) requests for \$21 million for this watershed initiative subject to appropriations. The EPA had plans to select up to 20 watersheds throughout the country for grants promising GIS approaches to clean water. The governor would have to nominate the watersheds by November 21.

G. Geospatial One-Stop Portal

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that the Geospatial One-Stop Portal is a federal e-government initiative to improve effectiveness and efficiency across all layers of government. It was 1 of 24 areas to improve the geospatial one-stop and builds on national geospatial infrastructure. There is a one-stop coming to a town near you. Can go to portal to find information. This breaks state and federal walls for easy access. If interested in being a part of the design, federal government would like local and state to help steer the direction.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU GIS Library, commented that it sounds like they are focusing on governments and not universities.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that the wording includes state, local, tribal, and federal representation working together to find requirements of portal. It is from National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC). The deadline is November 22, 2002.

III. Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Projects and Activities

Sherman Hollander, MDNR, had nothing else to report.

IV. Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Projects and Activities

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that they are working on Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Michigan State Industries (MSI). MDOT has finished linear referencing program to get physical referencing (PR) program – a way to get PR number mile points without GIS. They will make available to engineers in Transportation Service Centers (TSC) and regions.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that this can be made available to others also.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that it will give you the whole road and will give the PR number and can sort by mile points. For state trunkline it will give entire trunkline as it goes across the state. There is no way of sorting PR numbers. This might be useful in locating crashes.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that this is a stand-alone application

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that this on one CD. Planning on packaging it with framework layers and framework PR Finder so they have a choice of going GIS or non-GIS. MDOT has also provided Michigan Tech University Version 2 for Macomb County so they can collect data using RoadSoft for the Asset Management Council. Asset Management Council met several times. They will be using framework referencing system and want to make sure RoadSoft is a player in being able to collect

data. RoadSoft is free to anybody. There will be central storage agency, not a state agency.

Rob Surber, CGI, clarified that it would be the reference version and all the associated collected data. The asset management is new law to manage roads based on asset management approaches.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that it is House Bill 5396. Beginning October 1, 2003 the department and each county road commission and city and village that own mileage shall annually prepare and publish a multi-year program. It also involves collection of data and making it available in the statewide data storage area to help determine how to appropriate money. TMS will be using Version 1 by the end of this week and move to Version 2 as soon as possible. MDOT just received the Map Image Viewer and heard good things about it. The appropriations bill for MDOT funding for the state requires all season roadway information; they will be looking at adding that data to the framework. It has been coded on pre-Version 1 referencing system. MDOT has to pay assessments for water that drains off of their roadways to county drains. County has to provide a bill, have to show where drains are on a map, and have to show drainage districts. MDOT will coordinate with statewide efforts. When have a MOU with MSI will do pilot county with paper maps and have MSI code them in.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU GIS Library, asked if there is any interest in collecting for elevation of pavement - like a bridge.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, commented that at bridge sites, engineers would have. Local road commissions often benchmark the bridges for engineering applications.

Everett Root, CGI, asked if that data would be in the bridge data.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that she does not recall it being there. But if you have clearance and if you know the base.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU, added that digital elevation modules (DEM) are based on dirt. Animal and peoples experiences are based on the built environment.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that of the DEM data is rough.

Michael Hass, Branch County, asked Joyce Newell if for the drainage assessment data if MDOT need whole watershed data.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, responded that they need to know the watershed boundary and drains within the boundary and always had to provide map for the ones being assessed. It could be a photocopy of paper map.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, asked if this was for new street roads.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that this is for all roads because the watershed may have changed or size or district may have changed.

Everett Root, CGI, added that they when the drainage district is drawn, every person in that district gets charged based on the area of their land in that district.

Rob Surber, CGI, added it is only as they relate to state highways, but it touches a lot. Every county has a state trunkline.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that there are some counties don't assess MDOT because they don't have the manpower. That would be a way to get better information.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that part of the National Hydro Dataset (NHD) innovative partnership (IP) is to work with drain commissioners to finish out the network.

Everett Root, CGI, added that drain commissions can assess county-owned roads.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that it would benefit everybody to have uniform database.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, commented that it was mentioned that adding a new field for all-season roads, would it be possible to do paved and unpaved also.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that it is possible. The problem is getting the data.

Everett Root, CGI, feels that it should be incorporated with Act 51 process.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, stated that their problem is that the road commission finds it important and every time they get a new version of framework, they have to reclassify everything.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, added that this Asset Management bill will help. But there is a clause that initially they will work on federal aid roads only.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that he thinks it is worth exploring.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, added that if we can't add some of these attributes then they will have to maintain a separate file.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI works on a process where it is the same statewide. And the data is not available for some areas.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County, added that they took over certification and mapping for 9-1-1 for villages and it is unknown. Coding is county primary and added one extra letter to state paved or gravel.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, commented that the transportation-modeling network might have some of those attributes.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that they just went through highway performance modeling review with federal highways and when principle arterial roads that are not paved. Would be happy to have something that says paved or unpaved but getting data is bigger issues.

V. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Projects and Activities
There is no representative since Steve Miller retired.

VI. Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities

Eric Nischan, MSP, reported that they are finishing up Super-fund Amendment and Reauthorization Act (SARA) geocoding this week and will talk to Bill Enslin, MSU, to pull together the Map Image Viewer project for hazardous mitigation.

VII. Michigan State Industries (MSI) Projects and Activities

Scott Hodge, MSI, reported that they have finished 12 of the Act 51 counties and should have 2 more counties by Monday.

Everett Root, CGI, commented that CGI has received a significant number of counties back from MSI.

Chuck Bender, MSI, reported that the GIS facility equipment will move November 21 and personnel will move on November 22. There will be only 4 not 8 personnel moving. They anticipate being back on-line November 24. Chuck's contact information is (313) 368-3200 ext. 1602 and bendercw@michigan.gov Two workers have knowledge of the work being done now and 2 are steady workers and have individuals to pair up with the to bring them up to speed. They are coordinating ESRI training to start in December.

VIII. CGI Projects and Activities

Everett Root, CGI, reported that the new Michigan Geographic Data Library now has the 1992 USGS land cover data set that is available for the whole state. It has been cut up by county now. It is available on the web site in both E00 (which can be imported to a grid) and a polygon shape file with the class codes assigned. It will be available with appropriate metadata. Will also put up statewide shape files for Version 2. These

correspond to the county layers for download – all roads, MCD boundaries, etc. There will be a TIGER version and framework version of 2000 legislative district boundaries

Rob Surber, CGI, added that the positional differences but the content is the same.

Michael Hass, Branch County, commended Everett Root and Rayan Ray of CGI on their work on QVF geography.

IX. MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS Projects and Activities

Bill Enslin, MSU, reported that Version 2 is available. They added the capability to digitize points, lines, and areas of shape files but not to do editing. Can edit the table values, but cannot delete them. Have been working with the Central Michigan Health District to install for their 6 counties. They have worked out bugs. They have provided 2 tapes to MDOT for the statewide files and will do the same for Michigan Family Independence Agency (FIA) and DEQ. Gave an update to Joyce Newell for MDOT for a standalone install, one for Allegan County, and MSP. MSU has been working with CGI on the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), the first one for a watershed base. The tool version code will be set aside and they will do bug fixes. The program executable on their website to download and upgrade. They will start to move on the 2.1 version and this will probably be timed for release in January. Will get to some people who need enhanced capabilities. USGS has made a request for a drill-down tool to click on a point and get a whole series of info. Two high priorities are census data and soil suitability limitation tables. The statewide mosaics are final version for Landsat mosaics ('96-'97 series) digital raster graphics is done and includes the islands. Also put the mosaic up for the national land cover data database. The Landsat is 80mb and the national land cover database is 131 MB. They are currently compressed 10:1 in the ER Mapper ECW format and could fit on CD. The digital raster graphic at 10:1 is about 7.5 gig. Bill has talked to CGI about a fire wire to transfer to state agencies. It is assembled on an ER Mapper web server and will have a html page so that users, with ER Mapper's free viewer, can look at file or with plug-ins for different software products can use off the web server. May compress 10:1 even further if need be to have faster version for the web. That may be enough to put on DVD for distribution. Open for suggestions. With free viewer can convert to other formats but need disc space when it is uncompressed. Individual counties are now distributed the Map Image Viewer. MSU has in-house all of Lower Peninsula digital ortho photography (DOQ) from MDNR or on loan from Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Have been transferring to DVDs and doing checks for any problems. Have begun process for 5 counties to finalize quality control. Once assembled it is a 2-3 hour process. MSU is dragging their feet on Upper Peninsula it would nice to have 1998s available. They are going to do statewide '92 with black and white for historic purposes.

X. County / Local Projects and Activities

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, reported that they have signed a contract with Boyne for the MiCAMP County Conference September 11-12, 2003. The prices are the same - \$98 for double occupancy and \$138 single occupancy. Asked Bill Enslin if MSU has DVD copying equipment.

Bill Enslin, MSU, responded they ordered a new DVD burner as well as a CD burner.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, stated they video taped the NASA session prior to the MiCAMP Conference and would like to burn three DVD sets for whole event.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that the idea is to get the DVD out to people whole couldn't attend the conference.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, commented that there is a MiCAMP meeting this afternoon. The Michigan GIS Users Group discussed QVF and what in an ideal world what that would look like for state and county relationships. Also asking other state departments in an ideal world what would make their lives easier with county-based data. Jeroen asked that people e-mail their dreams. The idea would be to create GIS synergy where everybody gains. Most GIS mapping revolves around cadastral mapping. GIS wants to move on and diversify.

Ann VanSlembrouck, asked if cadastral mapping take a lot of time.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, responded that it does, but wants to create a demand and then they can justify a supply.

Rose Anger, Barry County, stated that it is not good that NHD is subject to homeland security priorities and moving toward urban watersheds rather than dealing with the national state forest. That brings things into the counties' realm where there is county GIS to participate in this. She has been spaghetti lining data entry off the new DOQ of the hydrology layer. Then having to wait 2 or 3 years for the state to do the urban areas. Then they can give to the state unattributed line work

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that Barry County is included in urbanized areas.

XI. Regional Projects and Activities

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, reported that they are still attributing 2000 census blocks on framework. Expects to be done by June 2003. They are trying to increase their staff level. They are also doing their 2000 land use update. They have done Monroe County and have given it to them for review. They had a successful Parcel Workshop. It was in cooperation with the Standards Committee and Oakland County GIS. The Standards Committee is planning a Utility Workshop this spring. They are meeting with their 7 counties to discuss a region-wide DOQ 2005 flight.

Abbigail Mueller, WMRPC, reported that the Ottawa County shoreline has a draft and maps are done and are now waiting for a public meeting to present to communities for their review. They are working a hazardous mitigation plan Montcalm, Osceola, and Ionia City. They are still waiting for funding from FEMA. That is the first project they were able to use framework. She recommended the Map Image Viewer to Osceola County and they have ordered it.

XII. Federal Projects and Activities

Gordon Rector, U.S. Bureau of the Census, reported that he checked into the postal products and their headquarters does not but that. U.S. Postal Service (USPS) is tight about their restrictions of purchasing it and passing it along to others. It is for sale and CGI already bought it.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that this is linkage between TIGER and ZIP+4 code. It is the 9-digit code and the TIGER segments that it is associated with. The linkage is updated with each version.

Jeroen Wagendorp, Allegan County, commented that there are a number of vendors marketing data assessment for verification purposes.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI is going to use it for geocoding of MapMI. If you cannot find an address it will still find a geographic location.

XIII. Other Issues

None

XIV. Next Meeting Date

December 5, 2002, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10th Floor, Lansing, MI 48933